

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE COMMON COUNCIL
OF THE CITY OF PLATTSBURGH, NEW YORK**

May 17, 2012

5:30 P.M.

MINUTES

Present: Mayor Donald Kasprzak, Councilors Tim Carpenter (W1), Mark Tiffer (W2), George Rabideau (W3), Jim Calnon (W4), Chris Case (W5), Chris Jackson (W6)

Absent: None

1. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING:

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the regular meeting of the Common Council held on May 10, 2012 are approved and placed on file among the public records of the City Clerk's Office.

By Councilor Carpenter; Seconded by Councilor Calnon

Roll call: Councilors Carpenter, Tiffer, Rabideau, Calnon, Case, Jackson

(All voted in the affirmative)

2. PAYROLLS OF VARIOUS DEPARTMENTS:

RESOLVED: That the payrolls of the various Departments of the City of Plattsburgh for the week ending May 16, 2012 in the amount of **\$ 248,679.91** are authorized and allowed and the Mayor and the City Clerk are hereby empowered and directed to sign warrants drawn on the City Chamberlain for the payment thereof.

By Councilor Jackson; Seconded by Councilor Case

Roll call: Councilors Carpenter, Tiffer, Rabideau, Calnon, Case, Jackson

(All voted in the affirmative)

3. REPORTS OF CITY OFFICES & COMMITTEE REPORTS:

- Report of Fire and Ambulance Responses for the week of May 10 – May 16, 2012
- Report from the Building Inspector's Office from January 3 – May 14, 2012
- Statement of cash receipts from the Library from April 26 – April 30, 2012
- Statement from the City Clerk's Office of all monies received during the month of April 2012 in the total amount of \$16,205.17
- Report from the Parking Violations Bureau for April 2012

RESOLVED: That the reports as listed are hereby ordered, received and placed on file among the public records of the City Clerk's Office.

By Councilor Rabideau; Seconded by Councilor Carpenter

Roll call: Councilors Carpenter, Tiffer, Rabideau, Calnon, Case, Jackson

(All voted in the affirmative)

4. CORRESPONDENCE & RECOMMENDATIONS FROM BOARDS: None

5. AUDIT OF CLAIMS:

RESOLVED: That the bills Audited by the Common Council in the amount of \$ 1,229,939.48 are authorized and allowed and the Mayor and City Clerk (where required) are hereby authorized and directed to sign warrants drawn on the City Chamberlain for the payment thereof.

By Councilor Jackson; Seconded by Councilor Tiffer

Roll call: Councilors Carpenter, Tiffer, Rabideau, Calnon, Case, Jackson

(All voted in the affirmative)

6. PERSONS ADDRESSING COUNCIL:

Luke Cyphers 160 US Oval and Chair of the Saranac River Trail Advisory Committee said I just wanted let everyone know that our official launch celebration is Monday, May 21st beginning promptly at 5:30 pm. I just wanted to take this opportunity not only to announce that but to thank the Mayor and Council not only for their support of the project the usage it's getting is just fantastic. The college is very happy with it and we're all very happy with it and we're just happy to get the word out. And I'm passing out some swag that SUNY students made they're Saranac River Trail bracelets. And just wanted to invite you all to show up if you can I know there are some scheduling conflicts. The other thing is to let you all know the advisory committee is still in existence and now we're looking for different projects that we can host for the community so if you ever hear of anything let us know.

Mayor Kasprzak said we appreciate your efforts too, Luke, I know that you've been there from day one. There have been some challenges we've made it and it's become healthy and popular and I've got a conflict on Monday or else I would be there I know you are going to do a good job you always do.

Councilor Carpenter said I know we usually don't comment during this period but I have had so many people come to me with positive comments on the River Trail and how it turned out. I have friends in Malone, I work in Malone, and they came down because they had to go for a thing at the hospital. They went and walked the River Trail afterwards and they were amazed by it. For someone to come from an hour away from here and to know about it and to walk it and to enjoy it, I thought that was pretty special and I wanted to pass that on.

Luke Cyphers 160 US Oval and Chair of the Saranac River Trail Advisory Committee said that's great and it's a tribute to you guys.

Kurt Mowry said I own the building at 187 Margaret Street which is on Margaret and Elm. I certainly got my money out of the Press Republican this morning. I feel awfully good about my subscription now. After reading it and speaking with some of you I wanted to certainly see you and let you know, and I'm sure you do, that I have a very vested interest in terms of what happens here. I saw a lot of comments from all of you and we're all interested in saving money and we're all I don't know whether interested of why that light

didn't go in or any of those things. Bottom line is it is what it is. I believe in safety just like the next person. I just wanted to give you just a couple of talking points and things that I've thought about. When the Margaret Street job and actually the Elm Street job happened. I wondered why because the way it used to be, and some of you might remember, that the road actually the pavement went to the sidewalk and the cars could pull off of Margaret Street and you could see from that corner perfectly. I read the article over and over to put my thoughts together to make it as coherent as I possibly could. You all refer to this study the study that was done. I just have insight on this I believe by taking out that light what you've done is you need a line of sight much more than you did obviously before. I don't think that when they did the study they were considering by adding that grass berm and the curb it would pop it out 80 inches and then cars would be parking. That's why you have loss of line of sight. So when they were doing the study and they were sitting there looking at it cars were pulled in the line of sight might of looked fine at that point. Maybe that's why there's confusion. I do want to tell you that when the two roads were done at the different periods of time Lockrow's, as we know parking in the City is a big deal, that building; Lockrow's, Larry Kudrle and Kathy Koster who are my tenants also we lost 3 spots over that period of time. The thing that kind of got me very alarmed were the comments made that well we can simply eliminate parking spots on Margaret Street. Well for me and that building that is something that is a nightmare. I quite frankly didn't raise up in arms when I lost them the first time, but, this is a serious issue for me owning that building. All I want to say is that I believe in safety just like the next person. Eliminating a parking spot from that building would be very financially bad for myself my tenants and their customers who do have handicap people that need to come in and go out. The line of sight issue is a great thing but when you have a pile of snow it's as hard to look through that as it is a car. The snow's supposed to go in the grass. I don't know whether that's the best argument I don't know what your answers to this situation would be. Maybe a 4 way stop sign. I don't know. You're going to vote you're going to decide what you want to do. I wanted you to hear my comments because I've owned the building for 23 years been at Lockrow's for 32, paid taxes in the City all this time and I just want you to know that I'm not prepared to bear the burden for this cost issue if that's the way it's going it would just not be fair. Safety first though.

7. OTHER ITEMS:

A. RESOLVED: In accordance with the request therefore the Common Council approves the return of a traffic light to the location of Elm and Margaret Streets.

By Councilor Case; Seconded by Councilor Carpenter
Discussion:

Councilor Tiffer said for me this isn't about expense it's about safety. I want to clear up some misconceptions that people have about traffic signals and this issue really recurred these misconceptions. Number one: traffic signals aren't a safety device they're a traffic control device. That being said intersections are not necessarily safer because there's a traffic light. Multiple studies show that accident frequencies actually increase when there's a traffic light. Traffic signals also are not a cure all for all intersections. Certain intersections actually fare worse with traffic signals. What traffic signals do they create congestion, they delay movement of traffic, they increase disobedience of traffic signals. People actually disobey traffic signals more because of the delay that traffic signals create. And a consequence of traffic signals is drivers will seek alternative routes mostly residential

or smaller streets to purposely avoid that delay. For me it's a simple decision we have a study that was conducted by engineers, traffic experts, they show that the warrants for a traffic signal are not met in this intersection. This study is good for 10 years. We aren't engineers; we aren't traffic experts it's not our job to do that. That's why we do these studies and for us to contradict this study to go against this study is not the correct reason to install the traffic signal. There are multiple DOT websites that I checked out. I checked out the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation and the Arizona Department of Transportation. They all use this Manual Uniform Traffic Control Devices which is the study that creates the warrants that we use. Every single one of those websites said that you have to follow these warrants you can't go against these warrants. Because these warrants are there to make sure that intersections are safe. Perception and opinion can't trump facts. So for me it's an easy decision. The light is not warranted there we can't put a light there.

Councilor Carpenter said in a lot of ways I agree with Mark I'm really not in favor of putting a light there. I had some thoughts on how I felt about it but after listening to Curt Mowry talk the one that makes the most sense to me right now is a 4-way stop if we really want to address a traffic concern that we have at that intersection that's probably the least intrusive and the least expensive. For me that is the first place I would go even before getting rid of parking spaces. I would prefer to see that. I won't be voting for the traffic light.

Councilor Rabideau said if this light was installed it would be coming out of the MLD budget rather than the general fund budget. Where would it come out of the budget if it came out of MLD.

Bill Treacy Manager MLD said it would come out of operational MLD budget.

Councilor Rabideau said would this increase the rates for the users at all?

Bill Treacy Manager MLD said no.

Councilor Rabideau said would there be any effect on MLD purchases during the year that you should make during the year or anticipate to be made or diminish any purchases?

Bill Treacy Manager MLD said no there's not.

Councilor Rabideau said I'm just curious as to the expense if it was re-installed.

Richard Marks City Chamberlain said there will be a small cost to the street light expense that MLD charges.

Councilor Calnon said I'm not opposed to putting a light there but I came in to the meeting thinking two things. One of them was why would we go from nothing to the most extreme change. Yeah it is the most expensive change and it also the most intrusive in terms of work in the pavement. So I really wanted to be sure that we took some time to actually think about alternatives. And one of the alternatives that did appeal to me was looking at perhaps cutting back some parking places to make the sight lines a little better. To me the critical sight line is when you're travelling east on Elm Street looking North on Catherine. That's the one I have the most trouble with because that's the first lane

that meets you. If I can't see to the south I can creep out a little bit and look around the cars that are parked up the street. But it's the left turn that really is the difficult one because you can't see there very well. On my way here tonight I decided to drive by it and actually there weren't any cars parked in those parking spaces tonight but my vision was pretty well inhibited by the hedge that's there as well. And so as I think about things and listen to what Curt's talking about in terms of business and actually my office used to be where Centennial Abstract is now. I spent a number of years in that building and parking was at an extreme premium and I used that intersection quite a bit. That's when the light was there and that was a fairly interesting intersection. I don't think a 4-way stop is as appropriate as it might be. I'm looking at the parallel streets. Catherine has a 4-way stop sign when it meets Elm, Oak Street has a light where it meets Elm and then we have just the 2-way stop on Margaret. And those are all 3 busy streets. So I think after thinking about this for quite a bit I am going to support this despite the fact that yesterday I said I wouldn't. I really think when you add up the fact that it has some business impact and some other negatives I think that this is probably the right thing to do. Does it meet the standards that DOT normally lays out for us? No, but I guarantee you that there are dozens of spots in the City of Plattsburgh that don't as well. That's not an excuse, but, it really is a statement that there are times and there are conditions where our local insight may be more important than a standard by the state department. So, I really seriously think that I'm going to have to support this.

Councilor Case said I've been thinking about this since I spoke to Joe yesterday and I want to thank Joe for quoting me exactly, I think that may be a first. Not you, but newspapers and media in general. I've been thinking about it for a day and a half. I had a very good conversation with Mr. Mowry this morning. He brought up some aspects of it that I hadn't even considered. Like snow removal and that he had lost 3 parking spaces already. We all know parking spaces in the city are at a premium we need more not less. I don't want it to be parochial just for Ward 5. I want it for the betterment of the city overall. It's very heavily travelled at certain times of the day. Sometimes it's not very busy at all. The other point I wanted to make is 2.4 accidents per year or whatever the traffic study said, that's too many for me between personal injury and property damage. And if you added it up over the years we get very close to the cost of the street light. A lot of people have to creep out in to that intersection. Those are called near misses. Near misses tell you that you missed the accident this time but sooner or later you are going to have another one. So what you're doing or what you could do you have to change so you can prevent more accidents from happening. So, I am going to support this tonight.

Councilor Jackson said it was funny two weeks ago after we had actually discussed this when we had a PMLD Board Meeting. I went over and I spoke with Curt's wife. She is the one who actually manages the business. He owns the building she manages the business. Interestingly, when I spoke with her she didn't have any problem losing one parking spot. So I don't know what the internal politics are at home. As Mark said the traffic studies don't warrant it. I agree with Jimmy I travel through that intersection my car is a little bit higher so the hedge issue I know it's there but because my vehicle is a little bit higher it doesn't impede me as much as it does you. Talking about traffic lights, where I live on Oak Street, I'm not trying to make a comparison of the intersection of Elm and Margaret to Cornelia and Oak. But, traffic lights don't make a darn bit of difference. Because people try, it'll be yellow, it'll be red they run through it. The number of accidents in that intersection far outweighs and there is a light there. I don't know if it does cause more accidents to have a light there

or not. Jim makes very good points its making that north turn going east that is the problem and where there are no cars parked there it is very easy to see. I am not going to support this I just don't think a light is warranted.

Mayor Kasprzak said I brought this resolution because I receive more complaints then all of you. I see more people when they come in. As elected officials we all have made very difficult decisions. As elected officials, we all have different priorities, too. I know everybody here's priority is safety none of us want any accidents to happen in that area. In researching the project funding was included in this project for a new light folks and it was purchased. The traffic study must have either been finished as the decisions were made, but, the light was purchased and I think it was with the understanding, unless they were waiting for the study or it didn't get there in time to make some decisions that the light was included. Then the City Engineer and the Council and the Mayor at that time, none of us were here, made that decision. George was here. They made that decision based on the study, Mark you're right I'm sure. But, why for decades has there been a light there and there must have been some study done prior to that, I would hope. I hope they didn't just start putting lights up without studies way back when. And with the growth in the north end which does have an impact let me tell you with traffic going back and forth. Yes, there are days when there is not much traffic. If you go there before school or during school it is quiet and you watch after school there is a lot of traffic there. I think there are concerns about safety there the parents have called me over the years. I'm not telling you I've been inundated. I've probably had a couple dozen phone calls on this over the years. I think, Jim you've got a good point, when Curt was mentioning the business aspect as well. If you look at that location since the light hasn't been there folks there have been at least three changes in business ownership or business in there. I did get complaints early on about that because people weren't comfortable without a light there turning in or backing out. I know that is somewhat of the case with the light there but they feel somewhat better with the light instead of the runway down the corridor. The history of accidents we can go to every street and find 2.4, 3.5. I mean I'm not even going to try to justify that reason. Except that I do think, Chris, your point of near misses is more important than the 2.4 year. And those are the people that call me not the ones obviously that have been in the accidents. I'm firmly convinced that light should never have been removed. And I think if you looked at the original project you'll find that was part of the discussion why they included it. But on the other hand we're not going to make it a perfect intersection. A couple people called me today and said there are other locations in the city that deserve a light. There's no question there are, but, if you're basing this, which I don't think any of you are, on cost that lights still going to cost \$80,000 to \$100,000. Right, Bill, because we've got some new requirements for emergency services in these new lights. So if it's just purely that location then I accept your argument that you don't think it's needed. But if you're going to buy in the future or invest in new lights you're going to pay \$80,000 to \$100,000 folks wherever it goes. So I hope that's not your reason if that's why you disagree with this. I believe regardless of that study in 2005 or 2006 there is reason enough for me to support this. I feel it will help the traffic near the school. We cannot have a policeman there all the time. You all know how many calls we get on traffic and speeding. We send people there no disrespect to the Chief; I'm on him all the time whether is Prospect, North Catherine, South Catherine, Margaret, near the school. You can't have a policeman everywhere every day. That is a short term fix. I think this goes back to being a long term fix. And is it perfect, no, but I really believe it is the right thing to do so I'm going to support it.

Councilor Rabideau said I think the gentlemen kind of pointed out. You can look at the past and say well this was removed. I think what he said was “it is what it is now.” And based on that is why I’m going to support the light because I think it’s a safety issue now. I believe that it is. I see it as a problem. The line of sight that you have and so forth and the creeping out and I don’t think a 4-way stop is the answer. Stop signs can’t always be seen because of foliage there’s all kinds of issues with stop signs. If we have other streets that we want to look at I can understand that too where there’s problems. It is what it is now and based on that I think to lean on the line of safety and reinstall a new light with all the new features that are on it for that street that is a major route in the State of New York.

Councilor Tiffer said if safety is really the concern then we would actually look at the alternative. Visibility is the issue that is being thrown out, repeatedly, then we should think about removing the parking spots. That should be the first move. The first move should be the removal of the parking spots. If there is a hedge that is an issue then this should be a removal of a hedge. Visibility is the issue a light isn’t going to change the visibility. You keep hearing safety and visibility then let’s actually do the correct thing and fix the visibility, do the parking spot. A light isn’t changing that.

Roll call: Councilors Carpenter, Tiffer, Rabideau, Calnon, Case, Jackson
(Councilors Carpenter, Tiffer Jackson voted in the negative. Councilors Rabideau, Calnon and Case voted in the affirmative)

(Mayor Kasprzak broke the tie in the affirmative)

ACTION TAKEN: Adopted

Follow up Action: None

B. RESOLVED: In accordance with the request therefore the Common Council approves Kevin Farrington City Engineer to advertise for Contract #2012-11 “Ready Mix Concrete.”

By Councilor Tiffer; Seconded by Councilor Carpenter

Discussion: None

Roll call: Councilors Carpenter, Tiffer, Rabideau, Calnon, Case, Jackson

(All voted in the affirmative)

ACTION TAKEN: Adopted

Follow up Action: None

C. RESOLVED: In accordance with the request therefore the Common Council approves the City Chamberlain to close the General Fund Budget for 2011 with the final budget transfer entry as presented and to officially roll-forward the actual General Fund results to open the 2012 budget year in the City financial system.

By Councilor Jackson; Seconded by Councilor Calnon

Discussion: None

Roll call: Councilors Carpenter, Tiffer, Rabideau, Calnon, Case, Jackson

(All voted in the affirmative)

ACTION TAKEN: Adopted

Follow up Action: None

D. RESOLVED: In accordance with the request therefore the Common Council approves Bill Treacy Manager MLD to advertise for bids for PMLD BID # 2012-5-1 “Purchase Revenue Electric Meters.” Bid opening date: June 12, 2012 at 11:00 am.

By Councilor Jackson; Seconded by Councilor Rabideau

Discussion: None

Roll call: Councilors Carpenter, Tiffer, Rabideau, Calnon, Case, Jackson

(All voted in the affirmative)

ACTION TAKEN: Adopted

Follow up Action: None

E. RESOLVED: In accordance with the request therefore the Common Council approves the 10th Annual Mayor’s Cup Bike ride on Sunday, July 15, 2012. Starting from and returning to the CVPH grounds via Prospect Avenue

By Councilor Calnon; Seconded by Councilor Jackson

Discussion: None

Roll call: Councilors Carpenter, Tiffer, Rabideau, Calnon, Case, Jackson

(All voted in the affirmative)

ACTION TAKEN: Adopted

Follow up Action: None

F. RESOLVED: In accordance with the City of Plattsburgh Charter, the 2012 Redistricting Committee is formed and comprised of Chairman Peter Ensel and Committee Members: Becky Kasper, Anne-Marie Farrell, Peggy de Grandpré, and James Barcomb.

By Councilor Carpenter; Seconded by Councilor Calnon

Discussion:

Councilor Jackson said I just want to thank all these people for volunteering their time and let them know we appreciate their assistance.

Mayor Kasprzak said I want to thank all of you for providing names and suggestions.

Roll call: Councilors Carpenter, Tiffer, Rabideau, Calnon, Case, Jackson

(All voted in the affirmative)

ACTION TAKEN: Adopted

Follow up Action: None

8. TRAVEL REQUEST:

A. RESOLVED: In accordance with the request therefore the Common Council approves two Police Officers to attend the “New York State Association of Chiefs of Police 2012 Annual Training

Conference” in Alexandria Bay, NY from July 29 – August 2, 2012. The cost will not exceed \$1660 and will be paid out of Asset Forfeiture (Treasury) funds.

By Councilor Calnon; Seconded by Councilor Carpenter

Discussion: None

Roll call: Councilors Carpenter, Tiffer, Rabideau, Calnon, Case, Jackson

(All voted in the affirmative)

ACTION TAKEN: Adopted

Follow up Action: None

9. RESOLUTIONS FOR INITIAL CONSIDERATION:

1. Request from Dave Powell Chief Plant Operator WPCP that Contract #2011-12 “Instrumentation-Water Pollution Control Plant” with Total Control System Services be extended for one year until June 27, 2013 for the total cost of \$45,000.
2. Request from Dave Powell Chief Plant Operator WPCP to advertise for bids for Contract #2012-12 “Electrical Services WPCP.” Bid opening date: June 8, 2012 at 11:00 am.
3. Request from Kevin Farrington City Engineer that Contract #2012-09 “Painted Pavement Markings” be awarded to Accent Stripe Inc. for the total price of \$108,300.

Councilor Case said on the Painted Pavement Markings is that for the whole city?

Mayor Kasprzak said yes and there is a list and we will send it to you when we get it.

10. NEW BUSINESS:

Councilor Carpenter said on the traffic light, Bill do we have a timetable on when that will be done.

Bill Treacy Manager MLD said by late fall.

Mayor Kasprzak said we have to approve it at an MLD Meeting.

Councilor Carpenter said it will be nice if it could be done in time for school. Last week we heard from a lady about the fire department. She made some very inflammatory remarks. What she told me kind of shocked me. What she told all of us, I’m sure the rest of us felt the same way. I did some research and I know others of us did research, emails bounced around and stuff. I just want to straighten it out. We **do** have a functioning Aerial in the City of Plattsburgh and we **do** have firefighters that are trained properly in using that Aerial. There are other things that she said that don’t have to be gotten in to right now. But, I just want the public to understand that yes we do in fact have an Aerial that functions and we are trained to use it and we are using it when we need it.

Councilor Calnon said to support that when it did fail its inspection this year it was immediately sent for

repairs. It was unavailable for 3 weeks while it was being repaired, but, it went immediately. It didn't have to come to the Council; it didn't have to go to the Mayor. It was sent for repairs immediately and returned to service as quickly as it could.

Councilor Carpenter said I'm Liaison for the Fire Department and I signed the Purchase Orders that's when I heard it I was shocked. I said wait a minute this doesn't seem right. There are a lot of residence in my Ward who live in the high rises, older folks and this kind of things scares them they want to know that their protected. So publicly I just wanted to state that we do have an Aerial, the Aerial does work, it is in service and we are trained to use it and we're good to go.

Mayor Kasprzak said I did some research and Mrs. McCleery's back there. You all received the minutes of the meeting, obviously, and there are some interesting comments. Basically, when I hear from anybody from the public I immediately go to the appropriate departments and ask the department heads to follow up on any accusations or any real criticisms on how the city is performing. Of course, the Aerial was one of them but will get in to that in a second. In reading verbatim the minutes there is some accusations that were made that surprised me to. But some of these things I did have Richard Marks utilize his staff and you all received that email. And then I approached and contacted Assistant Fire Chief Randal Stone and you all received that one. And in essence our administration and I can't speak for any other administrations. I don't worry about what happened in the mid to late 90's or early 2000's when it comes to accusations of any sort. There was some interesting comments about somebody donating in excess of \$700,000 to the city for a new fire engine. Then it changed real quickly to \$1.2 million dollars during the conversation these are the minutes officially. In asking the appropriate department heads, Mr. Marks and the staff couldn't find during our tenure here where there was a \$700,000 contribution to purchase an Aerial as we've all been here. You both addressed the Aerial repair. There was an accusation that there wasn't appropriate training which the Assistant Chief in his statement said "NYS firefighter minimum in service training per year is 100 hours. The Plattsburgh Fire Department meets and exceeds the minimum training requirements." There was a mention of fire marshals visiting in 2011 Chief Stone who's been here for 30+ years says "there has been no fire marshal visits in 2011 that I am aware of I have been the Assistant Chief since August 2011 and I have not been approached by any fire marshals." I'm not here to debate anybody. People can come here and they can tell us how they feel and we give them the opportunity to do that because it is the right of them to do that. But when certain things are stated that basically after we do our homework and we get it validated by our department heads are untrue that is disturbing. And the Aerial piece Tim you have a number of high rises in your Ward and they're going to watch last week's meeting and they're going to hear that and I'm glad you clarified that. Assistant Chief Stone I was very pleased got these back in a timely fashion. And Richard I want to thank you for scouring our records since we've been here that we never received the donation for an Aerial. The college and an arrangement through Chris Jackson has that we receive \$21,000 a year for an Aerial which is in a dedicated fund and we've matched it through our budgetary decisions. That is our fund that we will utilize when we purchase a new Aerial. And when that will be will be up to you. And that is the only money, Richard, you have received or we have received since we've all been together.

Richard Marks City Chamberlain said correct.

Mayor Kasprzak said so the record is clarified.

Councilor Jackson said Bill is requesting a special MLD meeting on 3 issues; annual purchase of TCC,

Purchase of vehicle and putting funding in place for new light Elm Street/Margaret Street.

11. CLOSING PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Kathryn McCleery, 14 Tremblay Ave said I stayed cause I was going to ask since this is now the middle of May what happened to our Annual Water Quality Report. Which is really a rhetorical question since I went on line and found that we don't have any quality water which is probably why we didn't get a report. Which has all sorts of implications because it has long been a concern of the State of New York that not only do we not have adequate water quality but we also have no remediation process that has been offered to the state. And in fact there was a Congressional hearing two weeks ago which I'm sure you're also going to tell in the minutes next week that you never knew anything about so therefore there could not have been a Congressional hearing investigating federal money coming to the City of Plattsburgh. For the record, our Aerial only goes up 70 feet if your more than 7 stories up you're in trouble. For the record, I said it is not fully operational and therefore as far as the state is concerned it doesn't exist. Fully operational is 120 feet. My turn...

Councilor Calnon said you amuse me I'm going to laugh.

Kathryn McCleery said finally, the extra money above and beyond the initial \$700,000 was for training the men on the new Aerial, not training. Our men are fully trained better trained then you credit them for. Finally, let's go back to the water. Our water is worse than in some third world countries. What are we doing about our water? And on that note have fun with the minutes next week I'm sure you'll tear me apart again. I keep bringing up issues that you don't choose to deal with. 20 minutes for a traffic light, wahoo. If we lose federal funding keep in mind what we're going to lose. That includes your Towers, HUD. And then since there actually is somebody with a worse more sufficiently determined way of rating us, and it's known as the State University, we could lose the college. Clean up the water for crying out loud and don't worry about the rest of the stuff. And by the way [to Ducky Drake from WIRY] the CEO that they're saying didn't give the money is your CEO.

Councilor Tiffer said I enjoy drinking my water right out of the tap. I enjoy it, it's great water please drink your water.

Mayor Kasprzak said let me just state for the record, our water quality passes and as you all know we do an outstanding job and I'm not sure where those comments come from but I'm very proud of what we do and we do comply very well with what we are supposed to be doing.

Motion to Adjourn by Councilor Jackson; Seconded by Councilor Tiffer
Roll call: Councilors Carpenter, Tiffer, Rabideau, Calnon, Case, Jackson
(All voted in the affirmative)

MEETING ADJOURNED: 6:18pm

After the Meeting Adjourned Police Chief Racicot said I just spoke to **Assistant Fire Chief Randal Stone** at 6:06pm. The Aerial reaches 102 feet and the State recommends that if the height of your building is

a 10 story building that it reaches 100 feet and we meet the standards.